## NC

Text: Developing countries should facilitate gold mining projects which involve demining landmines.

The counter-plan collects unexploded landmines and solves the environment, growth, and cultural integrity.

**Lu 12** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Laos is the most bombed country in the world; 270 million bombs were dropped across its landscape during the Vietnam War, 30% of which failed to detonate, currently affecting 50% of agricultural land. Less than 1% of land affected by UXO has been cleared in the past 20 years. Based on the current clearance speed, it will take more than 3600 years to clean up all the unexploded bombs in Laos. Not only does its land have the highest concentration of UXOs in the world, but it also has some of the richest gold ore concentrations per capita in the world. Due to the fact that Laos’ landscape is so heavily impregnated with unexploded ordinance, it wasn’t until very recently, that international mining companies began entering Laos to perform operations of mineral prospecting, exploration, and extraction. 270 million bombs trampled the land during the war time. Gold companies are now ready to trample the land again by using raw, unmitigated methods of exploitation. This project proposes the strategy of ‘demining bombs through mining gold.’ The bomb-impregnated landscape is seen as an opportunity to rethink the processes of mining. Simultaneously, gold exploration and excavation processes are used as mechanisms of rehabilitating and reconstructing the hazardous ground. Demining and mining are largely considered to be a major factor of deforestation in Laos. Both processes require a clearing of ground vegetation for operations to begin. **By strategically using** the **dispersive locations of unexploded bombs**, coupled with the existing cycles of slash and burn cultivation, **‘Mining as Demining’ becomes** characterized by **a** decentralized **micro-scale operation**. The migrating vegetation-cleared patches become the phasing structure of the mining process. Sharing the cycle of rotational cultivation practice, the operations take advantage of rotational land uses to minimize the operational foot print of mining, which enable more remediation phases, and also allows for the landscape to regenerate in its post-mined phase. A new harvesting system emerges: bomb, gold, and food. **Slash and burn** creates food for 1 year and **provides a cleared ground cover. After, a demining team harvests bombs** by sweeping the ground **and creates a safe trail for gold exploration.** A micro pit is burrowed for harvesting gold. It is later used as tailing storage area during the operation of mining for a nearby patch. In the post-mining phase, if the patch’s location is within the flood plain, the pit will be flooded after remediation. Similar to those bomb craters created during the war, which have been transformed by local people into fish ponds for food, mining pits will hold water for new aquaculture. In comparison, pits above flood zone will be used for terrace cultivation — these pits will be created either during the mining operation to maximize the south-facing side or by re-sloping after the mining operation. Together with other crops, opium poppy, a major plant which thrives on the land of Laos, is used to create a new remediative regional economy. ‘Mining as Demining’ exploits gold mining companies as landscape architects. **Rather than be** seen as **a major factor of environmental disturbance, mining processes are reconsidered**. Not only are they used as bomb clearing devices, but are also re-conceived **as ‘digging and reconstructing’, utilizing** the **by-product of mining** processes **—** pits and **overburden materials** — as an opportunity to reshape the war-disturbed landscape. For example, **extremely dangerous areas**, which are **too arduous for bomb removal** through humanitarian land sweeping demining processes, **are indicated as** high risk-**dangerous zones by using** the **overburden to** create double berms that **barricade it.** Ironically, these **bomb-protected islands will function as bio-conservation areas, prohibiting** any **further** human **intervention**. They are untouchable patches dispersed in this migrating landscape, indicating a history in forms of protected zones. The overburden is also used to build roads and berms that set up new aggregations around each micro-pit. ‘Mining as Demining’ re-envisions gold mining as an incubator for new economics. While the bombing operation during the war was an attempt to destroy the regional infrastructure, **mining as demining sees gold mining as an incubator for bringing infrastructure back** to the region and as **a generator of** an **improved livelihood**. Infrastructure, understood as a necessity for the mining operation, is constructed for connectivity and energy production, with amenities such as roads, plants and hydropower dams, as well as other basic civil institutions such as hospitals and schools. Rather than creating a single mega mining pit that requires heavy infrastructure, as typical mining operations have, mining as demining not only creates micro pits within the boundary of slash and burn patches, but it also recycles and redirects material flows; micro-industries emerge together with bomb and gold harvest. **Bombs are** collected, **sent to local** micro-**mills, and melted into steel bars for** the local **construction of** micro-hydro **dams or bridges. Gold is used to not only pay for demining,** or be exported by international companies, **but** is also used **locally for religious and cultural purposes**, becoming a registration of the mining and demining processes. The project poses a new linkage between resource extraction and post-war metal cycling economies, strengthening a livelihood that heals the war-scarred landscape. Existing conditions have evolved, materials are recycled and redirected. Bombs are reused, overburden is reapplied. **New economies and** new **industries emerge** together with this shifting ground. Safer land returns. These processes re-establish an inhabitable landscape of productivity, rather than one of destruction.

Landmines outweigh extinction and kill tens of thousands in Africa.

**Defense Monitor 96** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

Those whose business it is to defend the use of weaponry offer the argument that weapons, in and of themselves, are neutral, that they are not good or bad but can be used to either end depending on the will of their owner. There is one weapon that can truly be called "evil": **landmines**. They **are** known as hidden killers, **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction **in slow motion**, or the perfect soldier which never sleeps or misses. **They have killed or maimed more people than** have been killed by **nuclear, bio**logical**, and chem**ical **weapons combined.** Unlike other weapons, most mines are designed to maim. **It is the only weapon in existence which kills more people after a conflict ends** than while it is fought. A mine has no target and recognizes no cease-fire. **Unable to distinguish between** the steps of **a combatant or** an **innocent civilian it lies in wait**, or self-destruction. Disarming them silent and hidden, to kill and maim. all would cost from $20 to $30 billion. Every week approximately 500 It is estimated that there are also an people around the world, almost all additional 100 million mines in of them civilians, are killed or maimed stockpiles around the world. by antipersonnel landmines. **The UN estimates** that **100 million mines**, or more, **may be deployed in 62 nations. That's one mine** in the ground **for every 50 humans** on earth. The vast majority of landmines in use today have no means of self-neutralization or self-destruction. Disarming them all would cost from $20 to $30 billion. It is estimated that there are also an additional 100 million mines in stockpiles around the world... Crisis Areas The three nations with the largest landmine problem today are Afghanistan, Angola, and Cambodia. Collectively, they are besieged by an estimated 28 million mines and suffer 22,000 casualties every year (85% of the world total). The Cambodian conflict may be the first war in history in which mines claimed more victims, both combatant and civilian, than any other weapon. **The problem is greatest in Africa** where mines have been used extensively. Approximately 20 million mines are strewn across nearly one half of Africa's countries**, killing over 12,000** people **a year**. The large number of amputees in some mine-infested countries create entire societies which can be described as handicapped. In one district of Afghanistan, 1.95% of the population were killed and a further 3.5% suffered injury from landmines in a 2-year period; one in every 18 persons. By comparison, in the United States there is one amputee for reasons of trauma or disease per 22,000 inhabitants. **Mines also affect refugee populations by causing death and injuries** on the way home **and they make earning a living and reestablishing** a **normal life** much more **difficult**. The estimated 30 million mines in Angola, Mozambique, Somalia, Afghanistan, and Cambodia inhibit and endanger the return and reintegration of 11.5 million refugees and internally displaced people.

## Environment NB

The environmental harm of landmines outweighs pollution. Focusing on longer-term harms to the environment means the aff can’t solve.

**IJsslmuiden 2k** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

Though Smith is critical of the dominance of Western views, he represents this dominance at the same time. The examples he selects make that clear: with a small concession to malaria control and DDT use, his examples concern global interests that may not adequately cover the needs in developing countries. **As Africans, we will hav**e a **greater impact on health by tackling known** (but perhaps no longer interesting) **environmental problems** such as water, food and sanitation. In addition, in this continent in particular, **landmines**, drought, famine, violence and war **are far more substantial environmental hazards than** dioxin, chloramines or **air pollution** from local sources**, and they are not only short-term** problems. Perhaps, **the tendency to ignore local problems is one of the major reasons why developing countries have** such **difficulty with environmental** health **interventions**. Collectively, we have so far failed to convince either the rulers or the general public in developing countries of the importance of tackling environmental risks. ‘‘It is better to die at the age of 50 or 60 from cancer than at the age of 1 from malnutrition’’ is one powerful expression of the popular sentiment. **It is hard to conceive that those striving for immediate survival can be interested in** the **next-generation effects of endocrine disruptors** when their very ability to produce a next generation is not assured.

## Deon NB

Landmines kill innocent civilians. **Defense Monitor 96** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Those whose business it is to defend the use of weaponry offer the argument that weapons, in and of themselves, are neutral, that they are not good or bad but can be used to either end depending on the will of their owner. There is one weapon that can truly be called "evil": landmines. They are known as hidden killers, weapons of mass destruction in slow motion, or the perfect soldier which never sleeps or misses. They have killed or maimed more people than have been killed by nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons combined. Unlike other weapons, most mines are designed to maim. It is the only weapon in existence which kills more people after a conflict ends than while it is fought. **A mine has no target and recognizes no cease-fire. Unable to distinguish between** the steps of **a combatant or** an **innocent civilian it lies in wait**, or self-destruction. Disarming them silent and hidden, to kill and maim. all would cost from $20 to $30 billion. Every week approximately 500 It is estimated that there are also an people around the world, almost all additional 100 million mines in of them civilians, are killed or maimed stockpiles around the world. by antipersonnel landmines. **The UN estimates** that **100 million mines**, or more, **may be deployed in 62 nations. That's one mine** in the ground **for every 50 humans** on earth. The vast majority of landmines in use today have no means of self-neutralization or self-destruction. Disarming them all would cost from $20 to $30 billion. It is estimated that there are also an additional 100 million mines in stockpiles around the world... Crisis Areas The three nations with the largest landmine problem today are Afghanistan, Angola, and Cambodia. Collectively, they are besieged by an estimated 28 million mines and suffer 22,000 casualties every year (85% of the world total). The Cambodian conflict may be the first war in history in which mines claimed more victims, both combatant and civilian, than any other weapon. **The problem is greatest in Africa** where mines have been used extensively. Approximately 20 million mines are strewn across nearly one half of Africa's countries**, killing over 12,000** people **a year**. The large number of amputees in some mine-infested countries create entire societies which can be described as handicapped. In one district of Afghanistan, 1.95% of the population were killed and a further 3.5% suffered injury from landmines in a 2-year period; one in every 18 persons. By comparison, in the United States there is one amputee for reasons of trauma or disease per 22,000 inhabitants. Mines also affect refugee populations by causing death and injuries on the way home and they make earning a living and reestablishing a normal life much more difficult. The estimated 30 million mines in Angola, Mozambique, Somalia, Afghanistan, and Cambodia inhibit and endanger the return and reintegration of 11.5 million refugees and internally displaced people.

Killing innocent people doesn’t respect them as an end in themselves, turns case.

**Murphy 73** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

When' a man has a right, he has a claim against interference. Simply to refuse to be beneficent to him is not an invasion of his rights because it is not to interfere with him at all. **When a person uses** his **freedom to invade the rights of others, [s]he forfeits** certain of his **[her] own rights** and renders interference by others legitimate. (Kant calls this a moral title or authorization -- Befugnis -- to place "obstacles to obstacles to freedom.")27 **Thus** if I have an imperfect duty to help others, **I may interfere with those trying to harm** those **others because**, by such an attempt, **they have forfeited their right against interference**. Here I have the imperfect duty; and, since those attacking have by the attack forfeited certain of their rights, I violate no perfect duty in interfering with them. Thus there is no conflict here. However, **if the only way I could save someone** from harm **would be by interfering with an innocent person** (i.e., one **who has not forfeited** his **[her] rights** by initiating attack against others) **then I must not save the person, for this would** be to **violate a perfect duty**. And, in cases of conflict, perfect duties override imperfect duties. Suppose that Jones is being attacked by Smith. In such a case it is certainly true to say that Jones's rights to liberty, security, etc. are being threatened and that Smith, therefore, is acting wrongly and thereby forfeits his right to be left free from interference. Thus I would not be acting wrongly (i.e., against Smith's rights) if I attacked him to prevent his attack on Jones. Similarly, Jones would not be acting wrongly if he defended himself. However, it does not follow from any of this that I have a duty to help Jones or even that Jones has a duty to defend himself. Defense, though permissible, is not obligatory. This being so, it does not follow that Jones has a right to be saved by me. Thus, since it is far from obvious that Jones has a right to be saved even from an attack by the guilty, it is even more implausible to assert that he has a right to be saved if so doing would involve killing the innocent. (Consider the following: We are all, at this very moment, sitting and talking philosophy and are thus omitting to save the lives of countless people we might save throughout the world. Are we acting wrongly in so doing? If we are, is this because all these people have a right to be saved by us?) Now what sort of a moral view could one hold that would make one accept the principle that perfect duties, resting on rights, override imperfect duties, not resting on rights? I think it is this: a view which makes primary the status of persons as free or choosing beings who, out of respect for that status, are to be regarded as having the right to be left alone to work out their own lives -- for better or worse. This is a basic right that one has just because one is a person. Respecting it is what Kant calls respecting the dignity of humanity by not treating people as means only. **Part of respecting** them in this sense **is not to use them as a means in one's calculations** of what would be good for others. **It is fine** (indeed admirable) **for a person to sacrifice [herself]** himself for others by his own choice; **but it is presumptuous** (because lacking in respect for his choices) **if I choose to sacrifice [her]** him. This is his business and not mine. I may only interfere with the person who, by his own evil actions, has forfeited his right against interference. Innocent persons by definition have not done this. And therefore it is absolutely wrong to sacrifice the innocent, though not to kill aggressors. On this view there is something terribly perverse in arguing, as many do, that a defense of freedom requires a sacrifice of those who in no way give their free consent to the sacrifice.28 Of course babies are not yet, in the full sense, free or choosing beings who clearly have rights. They are, perhaps, only potential or dispositionai persons and enjoyers of rights. But if one accepts the maxim "Innocent until proven otherwise" they may be regarded as equally protected in the above way of thinking. For they certainly cannot be described in the only way which, on this view, makes harmful interference permissible -- namely, described as having, through their own deliberate acts of aggression, forfeited their right to be left in peace. Now this view that what is central in morality involves notions like rights, dignity, freedom, and choice (rather than notions like maximizing the general utility) cannot be proven. But it is a plausible view which may lie behind the maxim "Never kill the innocent" and is a view which would be sacrificed I (at least greatly compromised) by the maxim "Kill the innocent to save the innocent." I am myself deeply sympathetic to this way of thinking and would make neither the compromise nor the sacrifice. But I cannot prove that one ought not make it. Neither, of course, can my teleological opponent prove his case either. For we lie here at the boundaries of moral discourse where candidates for ultimate principles conflict; and it is part of the logical character of an ultimate principle that it cannot be assessed by some yet higher ("more ultimate"?) principle.29 You pays your money and you takes your choice. It is simply my hope that many people, if they could see clearly what price they have to pay (i.e. the kind of moral outlook they have to give up and what they have to put in its place) would make the choice against killing the innocent. Consider the following example: Suppose that thousands of babies could be saved from a fatal infant disease if some few babies were taken by the state and given over to a team of medical researchers for a series of experiments which, though killing the babies, would yield a cure for the disease. In what way except degree (i.e., numbers of babies killed) does this situation differ from the rationale behind antimorale obliteration bombing raids, i.e., is there not a disturbing parallel between Allied raids on Dresden and Tokyo and Nazi "medicine"? With respect to either suggestion, when we really think about it, do we not want to say with the poet James Dickey Holding onto another man's walls My hat should crawl on my head In streetcars, thinking of it, The fat on my body should pale.30 How can any such thing be in the interest of humanity when its practice would change the very meaning of "humanity" and prevent us from unpacking from it, as we now do, notions like rights, dignity, and respect? No matter how good the consequences, is there not some point in saying that we simply do not have the right to do it? For there is, I think, an insight of secular value in the religious observation that men are the "children of God." For this means, among other things, that other people do not belong to me. They are not mine to be manipulated as resources in my projects. It is hard to imagine all that we might lose if we abandoned this way of thinking about ourselves and others. My appeal here, of course, is in a sense emotive. But this in my judgment is not an objection. Emotive appeals may rightly be condemned if they are masquerading as proofs. But here I am attempting to prove nothing but only to say -- "Here, look, see what you are doing and what way of thinking your doing it involves you in." If one sees all this and still goes forth to do it anyway, we have transcended the bounds of what can be said in the matter. What about **noncombatants**? Though they are not necessarily innocent in all the senses in which babies are, they clearly are innocent in the sense I have elaborated above -- namely, they **have not performed actions** **which forfeit their right to be free from execution** (or, better: it is not reasonable for the enemy to believe this of them). Thus, in a very tentative conclusion, I suggest the following: I have not been able to prove that we should never kill noncombatants or innocents (I do not think this could be proven in any ordinary sense of proof): but I do think that I have elaborated a way of thinking which gives sense to the acceptance of such an absolute prohibition. **Thus,** against Bennett, I have at least shown that **one can accept the principle "Never kill the innocent"** without thereby necessarily being an authoritarian or a dogmatic moral fanatic.
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